III. Remarks

In the first paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 1-16 were presented for examination. Applicants note that on August 27, 2001, a preliminary amendment was filed in which claims 1-4 were amended, claims 5-16 were canceled and claims 5-50 were added. During a teleconference with the Examiner on January 19, 2005, the Examiner stated that the preliminary amendment was filed in an improper format, and therefore was not considered. Accordingly, examination was carried out on original claims 1-16.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks, which are responsive to the examination of original claims 1-16. After the amendments detailed above, claims 1-4 have been amended, claims 5-16 have been canceled and claims 17-43 have been added.

A.   *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112*

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner cited claims 1, 5, 9, 12 and 15 as having indefiniteness problems. Claim 1 has been amended to address the indefiniteness problem with the term "output report." Accordingly, amended claim 1 is now definite. Moreover, the 112 rejections of claims 5, 9, 12 and 15 are moot as these claims have been canceled.

B.   *Discussion of Amended Independent Claim 1*

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,836 to Ahlberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,146 to Parasnis. Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg in view of Parasnis and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047 to Wolff. The rejections of claims 5-16 are moot as these claims have been canceled. The rejection of independent claim 1 is also moot, as claim 1 has been amended.

The Ahlberg and Parasnis patents cannot be applied to reject claim 1 under 35 USC 103, which provides:

- 12 -

> A patent may not be obtained . . . if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains . . . (emphasis added)

Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated. In this respect, neither Ahlberg nor Parasnis teaches or suggests at least a "repository" or an "event server" as claimed in claim 1.

With regard to the repository, the Examiner referenced the cookie jar server 28 of Ahlberg as disclosing a "repository electrically connected to the service broker, the repository comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job." However, Ahlberg does not describe the cookie jar server as including at least one job, but rather associates the cookie jar server with a security application. In this regard, Ahlberg provides:

> The preferred embodiment further associates a given HTTPS request with a logical session which is initiated and tracked by a "cookie jar server" 28 to generate a "cookie" which is a unique server-generated key that is sent to the client along with each reply to a HTTPS request. The client holds the cookie and returns it to the server as part of each subsequent HTTPS request. . . . A separate cookie jar server 28, as illustrated in FIG. 2 has been found desirable to minimize the load on the dispatch server 26. This form of session management also functions as an authentication of each HTTPS request, adding an additional level of security to the overall process.

Col. 8, lines 44-51. Accordingly, the cookie jar server 28 does not anticipate a "repository . . . comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job" as claimed in claim 1. Rather, the cookie jar server 28 merely generates cookies to be used in securing communications between a customer and the system.

Moreover, Ahlberg does not teach or suggest "an event server" as claimed in claim 1. The Examiner equates the claimed event server with the dispatch server 206 of Ahlberg. The Examiner also points to claim 4 of Ahlberg as anticipating the portion of the claimed event server element relating to "dispatching a job for processing on a corresponding job server according to a predefined schedule." Claim 4 of Ahlberg reads as follows:

> The system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the fulfillment process runs periodically on a predefined time basis.

- 13 -

DALDMS/518919.1

Ahlberg describes the fulfillment process as a process for monitoring new customers being added to the system and sending such customers a welcome letter via the user's inbox. *See* col. 19, lines 38-40 and col. 26, line 67 – col. 27, line 3. The fulfillment process also sends information on the new customers to a fulfillment house, which may then send appropriate subscription packages to the new customer. *See* col. 19, lines 40-43. The fulfillment process runs on the StarOE server on a daily basis and typically sends information to the fulfillment house on a nightly basis. *See* col. 27, lines 1-2 and col. 27, lines 7-8. Claim 4 of Ahlberg appears to claim this aspect of the fulfillment process in claiming that "the fulfillment process runs periodically on a predefined time basis."

The claimed event server is clearly distinguishable from the StarOE server (or for that matter, the dispatch server as argued by the Examiner) and the associated fulfillment process. That is, the event server is not associated with carrying out a fulfillment process (i.e. monitoring new customers and notifying a fulfillment house regarding the new customers). Rather, the event server can be utilized to schedule a job on a corresponding job server.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from the teachings of Ahlberg and Parasnis, either alone or in combination. As claims 2-4 depend from and further limit independent claim 1, these claims arc now in condition for allowance as well.

B.   *Discussion of New Claims*

New claims 17-43 have been added, of which claims 18, 23, 26 and 36 are independent. Each of these independent claims are directed to various aspects of an enterprise-wide computer system for processing jobs, and include patentable subject matter such as a repository including "computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job." Dependent claims 17, 19-22, 24-25, 27-35 and 37-43 further define their respective independent claims, and are therefore patentable as well.

C.   *Conclusion*

A check in the amount of $994.00 was submitted along with the preliminary amendment filed on August 27, 2001. This check was meant to cover the additional claims filed with the

- 14 -

DALDMS/518919.1

preliminary amendment. However, since the claims of the preliminary amendment were not considered, Applicants respectfully request that the $994.00 be applied towards the considered claims – namely, claims 1-16 originally filed with the application. As original claims 1-16 included 5 independent claims, it appears that the PTO received an overpayment of $834.00 ($994-160). After the amendments detailed in this paper, claims 1-4 and 17-43 include 5 independent claims and 26 dependent claims. Since Applicants have already paid for 5 independent claims, Applicants request that the $834 credit be applied towards payment of the 11 additional dependent claims not included in the original filing fee. Accordingly, Applicants still have a credit of $284.00 after submission of this amendment. If any additional fees are required to complete this filing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 13-0480, Attorney Docket No. 68146988.715.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action or the Application in general, Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 MARCH 2005

Richard V. Wells, Reg. No. 53,757
Baker & McKenzie LLP
Attorney for Applicants
(214) 978-3006 (telephone)
(214) 978-3099 (fax)

DALDMS/518919.1